DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 023 638 SP 001 857

By-Lindsey, Margaret

The Substance of Professional Study for Teachers; Background Considerations.

Pub Date Jun 65

Note-23p.; Presented at the conference honoring Florence B. Stratemeyer, French Lick, Indiana, June 10-12, 1965.

EDRS Price MF-$0 25 HC-$1 25

Descriptors-Behavioral Sciences, Educational Research, *Environmental Influences, Professional Education, *Professional Recognition, Role Conflict, *Specialists, *Teacher Education, *Teacher Educators, Teaching

Because we are specialists in teacher education, because we are practitioners pragmatically testing our decisions from day to day, we are not only required to understand new ideas relevant to our activities and to test them in practice, we are responsible too for making ourselves felt in important places on critical matters. There are influential forces in our rich environment which can be used productively but which can also be detrimental: status seeking in higher education institutions where graduate teaching, research, and plain size are admired; competition within our institutions among demands on our time and energy for research, writing, teaching, and service; the prestige of scientific research; the increasing separation of foundational disciplines from study of educational problems; and the availability of new knowledge and methods in the disciplines of teaching fields. It is our responsibility to capitalize on the potential for good in these forces. In moving into centrally influential roles, it behooves us to guard against behavior that is inconsistent with our principles lest we become amoral status seekers. We must place central emphasis on our teaching while performing other functions as they relate to it, and we must use our influence to direct research activity into productive channels. (JS)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE SUBSTANCE OF PROFESSIONAL STUDY FOR TEACHERS

Background Considerations

Margaret Lindsey

ED023638

SP001857

Presented at the Conference Honoring

Florence B. Stratemeyer

French Lick, Indiana, June 10-12, 1965

THE SUBSTANCE OF PROFESSIONAL STUDY FOR TEACHERS
Background Considerations

Margaret Lindsey

In this age of systems analysis, paradigms, and models; of research influenced by fantastic sums of money and by newcomers to education; of computers and other technical instrumentalities; of de-personalization, de-individualization, and de-security-giving trends in schools and colleges; the substance of professional study for teachers becomes more clearly analyzed and at the same time more complex and awesome. What to our predecessors were relatively simple decisions to be made are now problems and issues, fraught with variation, rational alternatives, increasing gray areas, and expanses of the unknown or unproven.

To examine the substance of professional study for teachers at this particular time in educational history is no mean task, yet that is the task we have set for ourselves. It makes necessary thoughtful criticism of events in our time and space, events that relate significantly to our decisions. Our examination must include a process of screening, of rejecting and accepting, and of establishing priorities to which attention will be given. It is required of us that we keep our focus clear at all times, searching continuously for those ideas which can have meaning for improving the professional preparation of teachers.

Because we are specialists in teacher education, because we are practitioners pragmatically testing our decisions from day to day, we not only are required to understand new ideas relevant to our activities and

to test them in practice, we are responsible, too, for advancing the knowledge pertinent to our specialty. To determine at what points testing of ideas is most critical and to decide where gaps in our knowing must be bridged are also part of our task of examining substance of professional study for teachers.

Our elders have made clear to us that we who engage in the professional preparation of teachers have responsibility that is unique in at least three dimensions. First, the fruits of our work are of critical import to every other profession and indeed, to the very future of the society we serve. Second, as we "profess" we are demonstrating behavior appropriate to a profession; we become models for our students who themselves seek to acquire the very behavior we demonstrate. Third, unlike any other professional group, we deal with substance that is not only critical to the public at large but is also perceived by many as part of the public competence rather than as specialized expertise.

It has been observed that we are more important in the sight of the public than at any previous time in history. It is only natural that when education generally becomes a focus of central concern in our federal and state governments, when high quality and real equality of educational opportunity are ostensible goals of a society, and when the future economic and social comfort of individuals depends so largely upon education, that the competence of teachers in schools at all levels should be subjected to careful scrutiny.

For the next two days we are going to be engaged in examination of certain selected ideas and proposals with regard to the substance of professional study for teachers. To most of us this will not be an unfamiliar

experience, for we find ourselves constantly in the throes of making proposals, responding and reacting to proposals of others, trying out and appraising our own and others' ideas. We are almost daily confronted with variation, difference, and disagreement. We marshal our intellectual and emotional forces to support a position. We try sincerely to increase our ability to hear and to understand the ideas and propositions put forth by our colleagues.

We both profit and suffer from the richness of our environment. Surrounded by a wealth of new and exciting ideas, by opportunities for innovation, experimentation, and research, by numbers and kinds of physical and human resources heretofore undreamed of, by an unprecedented speed of movement in theory and practice, we are literally, and often irrationally, driven from one decision to the next. A commodity that appears to decrease while others increase in our lush environment is time--time to think, time to test, time to reflect, time to live. At few points are the joy and pain of a rich environment, accompanied by a poverty of time, more acute than in the contemporary setting of the individual college professor.

Making decisions on where we shall focus our energies, what we shall do with the precious time granted, and on how we shall approach the many elements in our professorial role becomes more and more difficult. Being students of our field, choosing and developing personal positions on matters of import, and maintaining and increasing our courage to stand up and be counted, move ever closer to the ideal and away from the real. Allowing others to make decisions for us, giving up in the face of struggle, and withdrawing from conflict are responses too frequently observed.

The thesis I want to develop in the remainder of this paper is that there are influential forces in our rich environment which can be used productively but which can also be detrimental, that capitalizing on the potential for good in these forces is our responsibility, and that failure to do so is likewise our responsibility. Moreover, these forces present a most lucrative source of power in determining the substance of professional study for teachers. The development of this thesis, through brief examination of selected influential forces, is seen as background essential to consideration of the theme of this conference.

Influential Forces in Our Rich Environment

It is not the war in Vietnam, nor the tragedies and joys of fast-developing new nations of the world, nor the pros and cons of a welfare state in the USA, nor the population explosion, nor even the compounding of problems in depressed urban areas that I wish to examine as influential forces in our time and space, although the impact of these movements is great. It is another set of forces, forces that fall within the range of our immediate responsibility and about which we can do something now. What are these forces? First, the influence of status-seeking in higher education institutions may or may not promote quality in professional programs.

Status-seeking in Higher Education Institutions

The term "status-seeking" has come to have negative connotations. We question the aggressiveness of an individual whose behavior is obviously motivated by a desire to be on top of the heap, to be a member of the prestige group. Yet we cherish social, economic, and personal mobility in our society.

We criticize the teacher who openly submits to the whims of superiors for the sole purpose of gaining favor and status. Yet, we do not admire the teacher who does not seek advancement personally and professionally. We respect an institution that is dynamic, that is raising its sights, modifying its program, conducting research. But we often question the motivations and the rationale of some of the rapid and vast changes in institutional settings.

Institutions appear to be somewhat like people with regard to their status-seeking behavior. They represent a similar range of variability in motivation and degree of soundness in their aggression. Concepts of what will achieve desirable status for an institution seem to include three primary qualifications: size, graduate programs, and research.

Clearly it is a misconception to believe that the larger the institution, the better. The other day a college teacher from a well-known institution commented: "Only a few years ago, we were an education department of twelve people. We planned together, we carried on studies, we constantly evaluated our program, we knew one another as persons and respected one another as professionals. Now we are a faculty of 147. I never see any but a few of my colleagues. We never have really stimulating discussions of our program. We never do any planning and evaluating together. I have no idea what is going on in any other course."

If the solution to the demand for higher education in our society is to be found in increasing the size of institutions, then it is our responsibility to see to it that our ways of behaving which accompany our growth do not indeed militate against quality of program.

Early last spring I received a telephone call. The request that came over the wire ran something like this: "We are going to begin a doctoral program in the preparation of college teachers next year. Would you be willing to tell me what you think we ought to be sure to include and what we

should take care to avoid?" Yes, he really expected an instantaneous response. Without commenting on what would seem to be a questionable procedure in developing a solid program at the graduate level, let me tell you about a follow-up experience with this same person and some of his colleagues. I met with them in Chicago in February and asked about how the new doctoral program was going. Oh, it was going fine. And the six college teachers in the group were all involved in it. Said one, "I'm not teaching any undergraduate work now. I work only in our graduate program." The others followed suit.

Now these six people work in an institution that has enjoyed for some time an enviable reputation for the teacher education program. These six people were the same ones, who a year earlier were reporting with great excitement some experimentation they were conducting in the professional sequence. When I asked about the preservice professional program, I met lack of interest and something I would describe as close to disdain.

You may say this is overdrawn; that it is an exceptional case. My observation is that this case is quite typical, for somehow we have unfortunately come to believe that graduate teaching is more prestigeful than undergraduate teaching, and that the institution with a doctoral program has far more status than the institution without it. How dangerous for professional study by future teachers that we should have such concepts of status, either as individuals or as institutions.

In 1948 Teachers College closed the Horace Mann-Lincoln School. The decision to do so was based upon the fact that Teachers College was a graduate professional school no longer engaged in undergraduate preservice preparation of classroom teachers and that findings from research and experimentation in a private school, with a highly selected population of teachers and pupils, were difficult to apply in typical public schools. Mentioning this action is

not intended to raise debate on its merits. What I do wish to note is that this action was frequently used as a basis for similar decisions in undergraduate colleges, where purposes and roles were distinctly different from those of Teachers College. In the present setting, there is observable extreme tendency for institutions to adopt practices, to establish priorities, and to take on functions, not because they are particularly relevant to their purposes, but because they are viewed as having prestige.

Who is to protect the preservice preparation of teachers, whether at the undergraduate or the fifth-year level? Who is to continue to put major emphasis into continuous improvement of these programs? Are they important enough to demand the total energies of some of our most able college teachers? If they are not, who is to determine the content of and to guide students in professional study?

Competition Among Priorities Within Institutions

A second influence affecting us is the competition within our institutions among demands on our time and energy. Institutional status-seeking--open or subtle, rational or irrational, ethical or unethical--is part of our environment. If decisions on steps taken to seek institutional status seem to be remote from individual college teachers, then we need to enlarge our conceptions of function in relation to such decisions and make our influence felt. Other decisions, however, are individual and personal, and we have control over them. These are the major decisions on how we use our time and energy from day to day in our professional activities.

Competition for a professor's time and energy is observable on every college campus, in graduate and undergraduate programs alike. Making decisions

on where to put one's time and energy is no simple matter. Choices to be made are complicated by real or imagined priorities within and outside of the institution, within and outside of professional education. It often appears that so much priority is attached to scientific research and certain other activities, that even a professor who desires to use his major time and energy in being an excellent teacher and in working with his students cannot bring himself to make decisions consistent with his desires. Choices are further complicated by real or imagined demands for publication, and for service to schools, to government, to public and private organizations, and to international education.

Teaching, research, writing, and service are all dimensions of a college teacher's role, and rightly so. All are especially critical for the professional educator. To achieve greatest profit from demands that professors engage in all four functions calls for clarifying our conception of appropriate interrelationships and balances among the four in terms of institutional and personal purposes.

We are here concerned with professional study for teachers and with college and university personnel responsible for it. Can there be any argument on what the central function of such personnel is? Clearly their main task is teaching. Students who come to their professional study expect to find a corps of professors whose chief concern is with helping them to become competent in their chosen profession. They expect a program that is sound. They expect teaching that exemplifies the best. They expect teachers who care about them, have time for them, and are skilled in assisting them toward their goals.

But the college teacher who is so busy meeting the daily demands of his students that he has little or no energy left for advancing his own scholarship

is not likely to be making the best contribution to his students. Conversely, the college teacher who is so busy rendering service as a consultant or who is so consumed by his own research that he has little time left for teaching and for students is not likely either to be contributing most to his students. The best substance for professional study for teachers, including both the curriculum and teaching, comes from a group of professors who place central emphasis on their teaching and who perform other functions as they relate to their teaching.

Whether or not making a speech, serving as a consultant, or doing research enables the professional educator to increase his contribution to professional study for teachers depends upon the scholarship employed in performing such functions. If they are undertaken with the intent of advancing professional knowledge, of securing additional data in testing an important idea, of studying approaches to a problem, then they are, in fact, part of preparation for teaching. It is difficult to imagine an excellent teacher in professional education who is not engaged in systematic study of some kind in relation to his teaching field, not because he is forced, but because he knows he must if he is to be a scholar in his field.

For the same reason, a professional educator devotes some of his time to writing. Few activities are as useful in clarification of ideas. The task of communicating in writing often forces, as no other activity does, the analysis of experience and observation and the abstraction from them what may have import to a wider audience. To expect college teachers to analyze their experience and to abstract generalizations that can be further tested is to expect what is not unreasonable nor unjust, but rather what is essential. It is self-imposed expectancy when the teacher is a student of his field.

Whatever a college teacher does with his time and energy affects his work as a teacher. Maximum positive benefit from other functions on teaching comes about when it is intended, that is, when research, writing, and service are deliberately selected and performed with the purpose of improving teaching.

The Prestige of Research

The halo around research in education and the power that accompanies research activities are so great in our contemporary setting as to demand special comment on the prestige of research as a third influence. For several years I have been dealing with requests from colleges and universities for recommendations of candidates for positions as college teachers in professional education. Study of these requests reveals some striking contrasts with such requests of a decade ago. Most outstanding is the emphasis upon research ability and accomplishment. For example, a majority of requests from all types of institutions for college teachers in preservice professional education state requirements for the position somewhat as follows: Degree--doctorate; age--thirty to thirty-five; experience--five years' teaching in public schools, supervisory experience desired; must have done some publishing and some research and should have strong potential for continuing research activities. The dean of one institution recently requested candidates for two positions in college teaching of elementary education. He said they needed six but succeeded in getting only two budgeted. A few days later, he called to say that now they had received budget allocation for four more instructors for the preservice elementary education program, but that these four were to be research specialists who would do little or no teaching and who would be expected to devote their major time to research.

Does anyone question the power of scientific research that surrounds us? It is power that attracts money, establishes prestige, opens doors to dignity as a scholar, and consumes time and energy. Generous financing of research gives power to the individual college professor--power to be released from teaching responsibilities, power to employ the services of all kinds of assistants, power to remove himself from the daily problems of working with undergraduates. And the professor thus removed from regular responsibilities gains freedom to carry on his research, to report it in scholarly journals, to make himself visible in various ways, eventually to feel the reward bestowed upon him by his institution and his "field."

But some research merits prestige and reward and some does not. Too often prestige is granted without discrimination as to the worth or significance of what is being researched. Further, criteria employed in designating a study as scientific research are too frequently transferred from physical sciences to education without appreciation of the differences between stable physical properties in a controlled environment and human beings in a complex environment of many uncontrollable elements.

Without any doubt, more opportunities for more people to carry on funded research are available today than ever before in educational history. How these opportunities shall be used and by what criteria the significance of researches shall be determined are matters for which we are directly responsible. For us, this responsibility is grave for there is every indication that professional study for tomorrow's teachers will be greatly influenced by decisions we make on research activities today.

Academic Disciplines and Professional Study for Teachers

A fourth important influence in our environment are the developing relationships between academic disciplines and study of education. In the early 1930's, the typical professional sequence for students preparing to teach included educational sociology, educational and developmental psychology, general and special methods of teaching, student teaching, and history and philosophy of education, in that order. Early in the 1940's, efforts to bring together and to relate more directly to education the disciplines of psychology, sociology, and philosophy resulted in integrated courses in foundations of education. A considerable portion of today's professional study for teachers resides in these foundational disciplines.

Through this same period of time, conceptions of the role and importance of study of methods of teaching have varied widely, but attention to such study as part of professional preparation continues. In the contemporary setting, relations of the several disciplines to professional study for teachers have new dimensions of critical importance. Let us look briefly at two groups of academic disciplines, the foundations of education, and the teaching fields.

The Foundations of Education. Making appropriate use of accumulated knowledge in and methods of psychology, anthropology, sociology, political science, economics, history and philosophy in dealing with problems of curriculum and teaching has been a difficult task since the beginning of professional study for teachers. For example, consider the role and contribution of psychology in providing bases for decisions in teaching. On the one hand, it has become clear that "animal psychology" is inadequate to the task of providing answers to problems of teaching and learning in schools.

Neither the psychologist nor the practitioner in education has been well equipped to interpret and make use in the classroom of findings from the animal laboratory. On the other hand, it has become equally clear that the professional educator is ill-equipped to advance knowledge about teaching and learning in the classroom without contributions from those who possess control over the knowledge and methods of these foundational disciplines.

Despite the long-term recognition of the necessity for bringing together behavioral scientists and professional practitioners, today the gap between these two groups of scholars threatens to become dangerously wide. In spite of long-recognized need for scholars in the several behavioral sciences who are interested in and prepared to devote their energies to study of educational problems, such scholars are rare.

What are the chances of developing and retaining scholars in behavioral sciences and social sciences whose preparation, interest, and work are devoted to application of their scholarship to problems of curriculum and teaching? Three observations on the present scene incline one toward considerable despair about the chances. First, there is the noticeable tendency on the part of responsible officials in teacher education programs to seek as members of their professional staffs, scholars in these disciplines whose interest and activities are not in education, but in the discipline; not in the application but in the basic science. Second, there is the marked influence of status-giving membership in professional associations. Many a scholar who could and would make substantial contribution by applying his specialty to problems of curriculum and teaching chooses not to do so because his membership or prestige in his association with colleagues in his field are endangered by such interest and activity. Whether the danger is real or

or imagined is irrelevant at this point. Third, there is a widespread disposition toward respect for research that is scientific, that is neat, that is well controlled, and that produces close-to-absolute answers. More often than not this disposition includes a corresponding lack of respect for research and study that are hampered by the realities surrounding problems in curriculum and teaching.

An increasing gap appears to be developing between scholars concerned with improving practice and those whose primary concern is in the disciplines commonly accepted as foundational to decisions in practice. This gap threatens to decrease to a minimum communication between professional educators and behavioral scientists; to segment the professional education curriculum into descrete parts and to force organization of these parts in sequential fashion, and to separate more widely than ever the theory and practice of education. Furthermore, such separation places the prospective teacher squarely in the middle of the gap, and holds him responsible for the most difficult dimension of professional study--discovering and applying the meanings of knowledge from these foundational disciplines to his practice.

We shall have to take careful steps if we are not to hang our students from a rope stretched across this chasm. Of primary importance is the influence we can bring to bear on our colleagues in the foundational disciplines to cause them to respect educational problems as worthy of their most scholarly efforts and to encourage their participation with us in study of these problems. We need to make our own scholarship observable and influential, particularly by precise and accurate definition of our problems, and of the questions to which we seek answers. We do not adequately serve our field of professional study for teachers when we limit our activities to attempts to take findings from behavioral science and apply them to our problems. We will advance our

improve professional study for teachers when we insist upon collaborative study by behavioral science specialists and ourselves on problems and questions that we identify.

Disciplines of Teaching Fields and Professional Study. Discussion of the widening gap between those disciplines usually viewed as foundations of education and study of education per se is quite uncommon. What has been common for many years is consideration of another gap--that between scholars in the several fields of subject matter and scholars in professional education. From many perspectives, this gap is more narrow today than it has ever been in the past. But the very factors that have narrowed the gap have also introduced new dimensions into professional study for teachers.

After long experience of standing off and criticizing the curriculum and teaching in elementary and secondary schools, specialists in subject matter turned their attention directly to developing proposals for courses of study and for teaching methods in their disciplines. Although other forces were at work, it can be stated with reasonable confidence that the interest of these scholars in the schools forced their re-examination of the nature of their disciplines and increased their concern with and their sensitivity to problems of teaching and learning. Encounter by many of these scholars with reality in the schools has brought about a new respect for education, for teachers, and for teaching. Such encounter has also made evident to them the necessity of joint participation by professional educators and themselves both in the preparation of teachers and in the continuous improvement of the curriculum and teaching in the schools.

New ways of looking at academic disciplines and new conceptions of their treatment in elementary and secondary schools are now available for widespread testing. Services of interested and competent scholars in the academic

disciplines are now available to professional educators in schools and colleges preparing teachers. The availability of new knowledge and new services has implications for general education and subject matter specialization of teachers, of course. But what of the implications for professional study by teachers?

Are the methods of learning in one discipline so different from those in another as to demand special study? Is it wise or fruitful to separate study of methods from study of the subject matter to be taught? To what extent must one know a discipline in order to teach future teachers methods of teaching that discipline? Consider, if you will, the implications of such questions for the professional sequence in preservice teacher education. Consider the implications for special methods courses for future secondary school teachers, for block programs in elementary education, and for student teaching.

A strange phenomenon seems to be taking place with regard to the academic disciplines and professional study for teachers. The once-close foundations of education appear to be moving away from direct interest in and contribution to study of teaching, learning and school programming. The once-distant academic disciplines seem to be drawing closer to direct interest in and contribution to improvement of school practices. It is a phenomenon with important implications of many sorts. To prevent further movement of scholars in foundations away from professional study and to capitalize on the movement of academic scholars in other fields toward professional study are responsibilities we dare not fail to discharge.

Slogan-classification of People

Thus far I have been speaking about influences in our rich environment that are observable, that can be documented, that are in the awareness of many people. Even a picture in broad general strokes would be incomplete, however, without mention of other kinds of influences. These are the influences that have become part of a climate effected by the combined forces previously discussed. To illustrate, let me comment briefly on one of these--the tendency toward classifying people.

The other day I listened to a panel discussion by a group of six professional educators and two school board members. The question under consideration was whether or not the school system should accept a large grant that had a stipulation requiring ungraded classes and use of television for fifty per cent of the instruction in the elementary school. The school board members were all for it, stating their reasons as: other school systems had done it and, we need the money. The superintendent cautiously agreed with the school board members and suggested that perhaps the money could be secured and then used in ways the staff thought to be desirable. A primary teacher moved into the discussion, presented some data on ungraded classrooms and on use of television, and raised questions she felt should be examined prior to making a decision. A secondary school teacher said she was for it, although she confessed she knew nothing about it. The discussion proceeded and a decision to accept the plan with its stipulations was made. Following the discussion, the school principal in the group commented, "Mrs. Jay (the primary teacher) is old-fashioned, conservative, and rigid."

Not long ago, an appointments committee in a department of education was considering the appointment of a new professor in educational psychology.

Said Professor Johnson, "But, he has never taught a day in his life. How could he help our students to relate his subject to their teaching? I believe we ought to have a person in this position who knows children, knows schools, and knows teaching in them." Immediately one of his colleagues reacted, "You're way behind the times. What we need is a scholar in psychology. All this talk about applied psychology is for the birds. No psychologist is going to be interested these days."

A group of college teachers were sitting in the coffee shop. Said Dr. Sterns, "I think I want to do a study of teaching, the whole of the behavior of a teacher in the classroom." "How could you possibly design a research study to get at that? Anyway, you won't get anybody to look at it unless you take a small part of teaching behavior and examine it statistically," his friend commented. "But, the trouble with such studies," said Dr. Sterns, "is that teaching is more than the aggregate of its parts. There is something to teaching that never gets into the picture when these neat, statistical studies are done." Finally his friend said, "All I can say is that they will classify you as a generalist, and an unscholarly one at that."

Dozens of additional illustrations could be given. Was Mrs. Jay rigid, old-fashioned, and conservative, or was she demonstrating a thoughtful approach to a professional decision? Was Professor Johnson way behind the times, or was he trying to hold a principle which has merit? Was Professor Sterns a stupid generalist, or was he grappling with a persistent and important problem in study of teaching?

There seems to be in the air surrounding us a strong tendency to classify anyone who raises a question about a proposal, who asks for some evidence to serve as a basis for decision, or who tries to stand on principle in making decisions as conservative, rigid, or unscholarly. The extent to which such

climate forces some professionals to jump on every band wagon that passes by, to deny their personal convictions, or to make choices about which they later feel guilty is difficult to assess. At any rate, it appears to me that the number of professional educators who are saying and doing things about which they do not feel good is far too large.

Implications

You may ask, what do such influences as those I have selected for comment have to do with professional study for teachers? Let me try to answer your question. Teachers are practitioners and those of us who devote our major time and energy to guiding prospective teachers in their professional study are primarily practitioners, too. And the destiny of those who would choose to be excellent practitioners is at stake in education. Moreover, the future of professional study that is designed to develop superb practitioners hangs in the balance. Those factors which have been pointed out as influential in our contemporary environment will determine, to a very large extent, what the future holds both for the practitioner and for the substance of his professional study.

Unless the tide is turned, we are headed directly into a future where preparation for the practice of education is viewed as unnecessary. Professional preparation will be concerned with acquisition of knowledge presented by behavioral scientists, knowledge that has no particular relevance to teaching and learning or to school curriculum but is general knowledge placed in the public domain for use by any who are able to use it in whatever capacities they find themselves. When the teacher leaves this preparation

and moves into a classroom, he may be smart enough to relate his accumulated knowledge to his practice. The chances are, however, that he will quickly adopt patterns of behavior and thinking that surround him and do little thinking on his own part about his decisions in teaching.

Unless the tide is turned, we are headed directly into a future where the college teacher who is a skilled practitioner and desires to continue to be one cannot maintain his status on the campus. Either he will submerge his own desire and deny what he believes to be worthy, or he will be among those who cannot afford to stay in the college because he has failed to receive promotions and salary increments. The chances are very great that personal and professional welfare will force this college teacher to submit to the influences around him and stay on the campus, as a teacher, yes, but devoting most of his time to activities often unrelated to his teaching and inconsistent with his talent. What kind of teaching can such a person do?

Unless the tide is turned, we are headed right into a future where studies in education that are desperately needed cannot be done for lack of support, for fear of failure, for low prestige. At the same time, it may be very difficult to relate research that is generously funded, enjoys high prestige, and is viewed as successful to the real and important problems of curriculum and teaching.

Unless the tide is turned, we are headed directly into a future where persons become unimportant, where interpersonal relationships are neutral, where real program planning is unknown, where the size and mechanization of our institutions, and the demands on personnel within them, make personal and professional satisfactions for both students and faculty decrease to a new low.

Unless the tide is turned, we are headed directly into a future where the art and the humaneness of our profession are in ill-repute while the science gallops ahead as though it were the complete domain of professional study for teachers. What kinds of teaching will take place in college and in schools when the art and humaneness are removed?

The future of professional study for teachers depends upon our wise use of the rich environment surrounding us and upon our making of ourselves the central and most powerful influential factor in that environment.

The heaviest responsibility we confront today is making ourselves felt in important places and on critical matters. Everyone concerned with professional study for teachers must assume a central role as a member of a department, in association with his colleagues in other departments, and on policy making groups of the institution. To do this requires basically two characteristics: scholarship and communication. Demonstrated scholarship speaks loudly and is heard in most quarters by most people. Communication, including most importantly the ability to hear others, is critical to assertion of powerful influence. Quite naturally, effective and influential communication emanates from clear thinking.

In moving into centrally influential roles, it behooves us to guard against behavior that is inconsistent with our principles lest we become amoral status-seekers. It is incumbent upon us to examine continuously and critically those principles in which we believe and to stand on those principles, even though we are counted among the few rather than the many.

Large institutions where graduate teaching, research, and plain size are admired; competition among research, writing, teaching and service within institutions; the prestige of scientific research; the increasing

separation of foundational disciplines from study of educational problems; the availability of new knowledge and methods in the disciplines of teaching fields; the tendency toward slogan classification of persons--all these are influences in our environment with which we must deal wisely and directly. But none of these influences is more than candle-light in comparison with the powerful light our individual and combined influence can effect in the professional study for teachers.